

APPLICANT(S): GAT, Tal et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/748,173
FILED: December 31, 2003
Page 6

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
FEB 04 2008

REMARKS

The present Response and Amendment is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 11, 12, 14-16, 20, and 22-25 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 12, and 20 have been amended.

Claims 3, 5, 9-10, 13, 17-19 and 21 have been previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

The amendments to the claims add no new matter.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4, 6-8, 11-12, 14-16, 20 and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs, as failing to comply with the written description requirement and as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicants regard as the invention.

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the deficiencies noted by the Examiner and includes, *inter alia* "bypassing a branch prediction to an instruction fetch unit by the end of a clock cycle in which said branch prediction is stored in said queue".

Claims 12 and 20 have been amended to overcome the deficiencies noted by the Examiner and each includes, *inter alia*, a "branch prediction unit to bypass a branch prediction to said instruction fetch unit by the end of a clock cycle in which said branch prediction is stored in said queue".

APPLICANT(S): GAT, Tal et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/748,173
FILED: December 31, 2003
Page 7

Each of claims 2, 4, 6-8, 11, 14-16 and 22-25 depends, directly or indirectly, from one of independent claims 1, 12 and 20, and includes all the features of the claim from which it depends as well as additional distinguishing features, and is therefore likewise allowable.

Accordingly Applicants request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs rejections of claims 1-2, 4, 6-8, 11-12, 14-16, 20 and 22-25 be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection Based on Reinman, Giacalone and Tran

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4, 6-8, 11-12, 14-16, 20 and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Reinman et al., "Optimizations Enabled by a Decoupled Front-End Architecture" ("Reinman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,272,624 to Giacalone et al. ("Giacalone") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,101,577 to Tran ("Tran"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection of claims 1-2, 4, 6-8, 11-12, 14-16, 20 and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Reinman in view of Giacalone in view Tran in view of the remarks that follow.

As stated by the Examiner in the Office Action on page 12 in the "Response to Arguments" section of the Office Action, the inclusion of a limitation that results in bypassing a branch prediction in Figure 4 to the instruction fetch unit in the second prediction cycle would overcome the current rejections of Reinman, Giacalone and Tran. Accordingly, Applicants have amended independent claim 1, 12 and 20 to include the limitation indicated by the Examiner. The limitations in the currently pending claims are not limited to the embodiment shown in Figure 4.

Applicants' independent claim 1 as amended includes, *inter alia* "bypassing a branch prediction to an instruction fetch unit by the end of a clock cycle in which said branch prediction is stored in said queue".

Each of Applicant's independent claims 12 and 20 as amended include, *inter alia* a "branch prediction unit to bypass a branch prediction to said instruction fetch unit by the end of a clock cycle in which said branch prediction is stored in said queue".

According to M.P.E.P. § 2142, in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

APPLICANT(S): GAT, Tal et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/748,173
FILED: December 31, 2003
Page 8

Without conceding the appropriateness of the combination, Applicants respectfully submit that none of Reinman, Giacalone or Tran, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all the limitations of independent claims 1, 12 and 20 as amended, in particular the limitations quoted above, and therefore a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established by the Examiner with respect to amended claims 1, 12 and 20.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 12 and 20 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Reinman in view of Giacalone in view of Tran be withdrawn.

Each of claims 2, 4, 6-8, 11, 14-16 and 22-25 depends, directly or indirectly, from one of independent claims 1, 12 and 20, and includes all the features of the claim from which it depends as well as additional distinguishing features, and is therefore likewise allowable.

In view of the above, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-2, 4, 6-8, 11-12, 14-16, 20 and 22-25 under 35 USC §103(a) over Reinman in view of Giacalone in view of Tran be withdrawn.

Conclusion


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the pending claims are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Response and Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

APPLICANT(S): GAT, Tal et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/748,173
FILED: December 31, 2003
Page 9

Aside from the fee for the RCE and the petition for a two month extension, being requested separately, no fees are believed to be due associated with this paper. However, if any such fees are due, please charge such fees to deposit account No. 50-3355.

Respectfully submitted,


Caleb Pollack
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,912

Dated: February 4, 2008

Pearl, Cohen, Zedek, Latzer LLP.
1500 Broadway, 12th Floor
New York, NY 10036
Phone: 646-878-0800
Fax: 646-878-0801